arXiv:1411.4678v1 [math.AP] 17 Nov 2014

GENERALIZED SPECTRUM OF STEKLOV-ROBIN PROBLEM FOR ELLIPTIC SYSTEM

ALZAKI.M.M. FADLALLAH

Abstract. We will study the generalized Steklov–Robin eigensystem (with possibly matrices weights) in which the spectral parameter is both in the system and on the boundary. We prove the existence of of an increasing unbounded sequence of eigenvalues . The method of proof makes use of variational arguments.

1. Introduction

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta U + A(x)U &= \mu M(x)U \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu} + \Sigma(x)U &= \mu P(x)U \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$ is a bounded domain with boundary $\partial\Omega$ of class $C^{0,1}$, $U = [u_1, \ldots, u_k]^T \in H(\Omega)$ and the matrix

$$A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}(x) & a_{12}(x) & \cdots & a_{1k}(x) \\ a_{21}(x) & a_{22}(x) & \cdots & a_{2k}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{k1}(x) & a_{k2}(x) & \cdots & a_{kk}(x) \end{bmatrix}$$

Verifies the following conditions:

- $(A1)$ The functions $a_{ij} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $a_{ij}(x) \geq 0$, $\forall\ i, j = 1, \cdots, k$, $x \in \Omega$ with strict inequality on a set of positive measure of Ω.
- $(A2)$ $A(x)$ is positive semidefinite matrix on $\mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$, almost everywhere $x \in \Omega$, and $A(x)$ is positive definite on a set of positive measure of Ω with $a_{ij} \in L^p(\Omega)$ $\forall\ i, j = 1, \cdots, k$, for $p > \frac{N}{2}$ when $N \geq 3$, and $p > 1$ when $N = 2$

$\partial/\partial\nu := \nu \cdot \nabla$ is the outward (unit) normal derivative on $\partial\Omega$, The matrix Σ is

$$\Sigma(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{11}(x) & \sigma_{12}(x) & \cdots & \sigma_{1k}(x) \\ \sigma_{21}(x) & \sigma_{22}(x) & \cdots & \sigma_{2k}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{k1}(x) & \sigma_{k2}(x) & \cdots & \sigma_{kk}(x) \end{bmatrix}$$

Verifies the following conditions:

- $(S1)$ The functions $\sigma_{ij} : \partial\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma_{ij}(x) \geq 0$, $\forall\ i, j = 1, \cdots, k$ $x \in \partial\Omega$
- $(S2)$ $\Sigma(x)$ is positive semidefinite matrix on $\mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$, almost everywhere $x \in \partial\Omega$, and $\Sigma(x)$ is positive definite on a set of positive measure of $\partial\Omega$ with $\sigma_{ij} \in L^q(\partial\Omega)$ $\forall\ i, j = 1, \cdots, k$, for $q \geq N-1$ when $N \geq 3$, and $q > 1$ when $N = 2$

Remark 1.1.
Conditions $(A2), (S2)$ *are equivalent to*

$$\int_\Omega \langle A(x)U, U\rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle \, dx > 0$$

We can put condition $(S2)$ *in* A *and condition* $(A2)$ *in* Σ *i.e.; interchange conditions in* A *and* Σ

Note that the eigensystem (1.1) includes as special cases the weighted Steklov eigenproblem for a class of elliptic system when ($\Sigma(x) = M(x) \equiv 0$, $A(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2}$ and $P(x) = I$ where I is identity matrix that was considered in [GMR2013]. For scalar case generalized Steklov-Robin spectrum of the scalar case that was considered in [Mav2012] as well as weighted Robin-Neumann eigenproblem when $(P(x) \equiv 0$ and $M(x) = I)$ that was considered in [Auc2012] and [GMR2013]. Under conditions of $A(x), \Sigma(x)$ together with the hypothesis on Ω, we have

2. Notations definitions

To put our results into the context, we have collected in this shore section some relevant notations and definitions for our purposes. Throughout this work, H_0^1, $H^1(\Omega)$ denotes the usual real Sobolev space of functions on Ω.

- $k \in \mathbb{N}$
- $H(\Omega) = H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \times \cdots \times H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) = [H^1(\Omega)]^k$
- $H_0(\Omega) = H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times \cdots \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega) = [H_0^1(\Omega)]^k$
- $L_k^p(\Omega) = L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) \times \cdots \times L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) = [L^p(\Omega)]^N$
- $L_k^p(\partial\Omega) = L^p(\partial\Omega) \times L^p(\partial\Omega) \times \cdots \times L^p(\partial\Omega) \times L^p(\partial\Omega) = [L^p(\partial\Omega)]^k$

Definition 2.1. Cooperative-plus *Cooperative-plus matrix means that all the entries of the matrix are non-negative*

- The embedding of $H^1(\Omega)$ into $L^p(\Omega)$ is continuous for $1 \le p \le p(N)$ and compact for $1 \le p \le p(N)$ where $p(N) = \frac{2N}{N-2}$ if $N \ge 3$ and $p(N) = \infty$ if $N = 2$ (see [EG1992] for more details)
- $\langle x, y\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i y_i \ \forall \ x, y \in H(\Omega)$ then

$$\langle U, V\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = \int_\Omega [\nabla U.\nabla V + \langle A(x)U, V\rangle] \ dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, V\rangle \, dx \tag{2.1}$$

defines an inner product for $H(\Omega)$, with associated norm $||.||_{(A,\Sigma)}$

$$||U||_{(A,\Sigma)} = \int_\Omega [\nabla U.\nabla U + \langle A(x)U, U\rangle] \ dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle \, dx \tag{2.2}$$

this norm is equivalent to the standard $H(\Omega)-$norm

Claim: $< .,. >_{(A,\Sigma)}$ is inner product on $H(\Omega)$

Proof. Let U, V and W be vectors on $\in H(\Omega)$ and α be a scalar in $\mathbb{R}$, then:

(1)

$$\langle U + V, W\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} =$$

$$\int_\Omega [\nabla(U + V).\nabla W + \langle A(x)(U + V), W\rangle] \ dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U + V, W\rangle \, dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega [\nabla U.\nabla W + \langle A(x)U, W\rangle] \ dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, W\rangle \, dx =$$

$$\int_\Omega [\nabla V.\nabla W + \langle A(x)V, W\rangle]\ dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)V, W\rangle\, dx = \langle U, W\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} + \langle V, W\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

(2)

$$\langle \alpha U, W\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = \int_\Omega [\nabla \alpha U.\nabla W + \langle A(x)\alpha U, W\rangle]\ dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \alpha\Sigma(x)U, W\rangle\, dx =$$

$$\alpha\left(\int_\Omega [\nabla U.\nabla W + \langle A(x)U, W\rangle] + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \sigma(x)U, W\rangle\, dx\right) = \alpha\langle U, W\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

(3) Since A, Σ are symmetric and the $\langle x, y\rangle = \langle y, x\rangle$

$$\langle U, V\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = \int_\Omega [\nabla U.\nabla V + \langle A(x)U, V\rangle] + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, V\rangle\, dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega [\nabla U.\nabla V + \langle U, A(x)V\rangle] + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle U, \Sigma(x)V\rangle\, dx =$$

$$\int_\Omega [\nabla V.\nabla U + \langle A(x)V, U\rangle] + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)V, U\rangle\, dx = \langle V, U\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

(4) Since we have that $\langle A(x)U, U\rangle \geq 0\ \forall\ U \in H(\Omega)$ on Ω (semidefinite) and $\langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle \geq 0\ \forall\ U \in H(\Omega)$ on $\partial\Omega$ (semidefinite) so we have that

$$\langle U, U\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = \int_\Omega [\nabla U.\nabla U + \langle A(x)U, U\rangle] = \int_\Omega \left[|\nabla U|^2 + \langle A(x)U, U\rangle\right] + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle\, dx \geq 0$$

if

$$\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla U|^2 + \langle A(x)U, U\rangle\right] + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle\, dx = 0$$

then

$$\langle A(x)U, U\rangle = 0$$

iff $U = 0$ on Ω, and

$$\langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle = 0$$

iff $U = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

So, $\langle U, U\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} \geq 0$, $\langle U, U\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = 0$ iff $U = 0$

Indeed $\langle ., .\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)}$ is inner product on $H(\Omega)$ □

3. Generalized Steklov-Robin eigensystem

In this section, we will study the generalized spectrum that will be used for the comparison with the nonlinearities in the system (**??**). This spectrum includes the Steklov, Neumann and Robin spectra, We therefore generalize the results in [Auc2012], and [GMR2013]
. Consider the elliptic system

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta U + A(x)U &= \mu M(x)U \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu} + \Sigma(x)U &= \mu P(x)U \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Where

$$M(x) = \begin{bmatrix} m_{11}(x) & m_{12}(x) & \cdots & m_{1k}(x) \\ m_{21}(x) & m_{22}(x) & \cdots & m_{2k}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ m_{k1}(x) & m_{k2}(x) & \cdots & m_{kk}(x) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$P(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{11}(x) & \rho_{12}(x) & \cdots & \rho_{1k}(x) \\ \rho_{21}(x) & \rho_{22}(x) & \cdots & \rho_{2k}(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho_{k1}(x) & \rho_{k2}(x) & \cdots & \rho_{kk}(x) \end{bmatrix}$$

(M1) Where $M(x)$ is positive definite matrix on $\mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$, almost everywhere $x \in \Omega$, The functions $m_{ij} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $m_{ij}(x) \geq 0$, $\forall\, i, j = 1, \cdots, k$ $x \in \Omega$, with strict inequality on a set of positive measure of Ω, $m_{ij} \in L^p(\Omega)$ $\forall\, i, j = 1, \cdots, k$, for $p \geq \frac{N}{2}$ when $N \geq 3$, and $p > 1$ when $N = 2$.

(P1) Where $P(x)$ is positive semidefinite matrix on $\mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$, almost everywhere $x \in \partial\Omega$, and positive define on a set of positive measure of $\partial\Omega$ with $\rho_{ij} \in L^q(\partial\Omega)$ $\forall i, j = 1, \cdots, k$, for $q \geq N-1$ when $N \geq 3$, and $q > 1$ when $N = 2$.

(MP) And $(m_{ij}, \rho_{ij}) > 0$; that is $m_{ij}(x) \geq 0$ a.e in Ω, $\rho_{ij}(x) \geq 0$ a.e on $\partial\Omega$ for all $i, j = 1, \cdots, k$ such that

$$\int_\Omega m_{ij}(x)dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \rho_{ij}(x)dx > 0 \ \forall\ i, j = 1, \cdots, k,$$

Assume that $A(x),\ \Sigma(x),\ M(x),\ P(x)$ are Verifies the following assumption :

Assumption 1. *$A(x)$ is positive definite on a set of positive measure of Ω with $A(x) \in L^p(\Omega)$ for $p > \frac{N}{2}$ when $N \geq 3$, and $p > 1$ when $N = 2$.*

OR *$\Sigma(x)$ is positive definite on a set of positive measure of $\partial\Omega$ with $\Sigma(x) \in L^q(\partial\Omega)$ for $q \geq N-1$ when $N \geq 3$, and $q > 1$ when $N = 2$*

AND *$M(x)$ is positive definite on a set of positive measure of Ω with $M(x) \in L^p(\Omega)$ for $p > \frac{N}{2}$ when $N \geq 3$, and $p > 1$ when $N = 2$.*

OR *$P(x)$ is positive definite on a set of positive measure of $\partial\Omega$ with $P(x) \in L^q(\partial\Omega)$ for $q \geq N-1$ when $N \geq 3$, and $q > 1$ when $N = 2$.*

Remark 3.1. *Since $A(x),\ \Sigma(x),\ M(x),\ P(x)$ are satisfied $(A2),\ (S2),\ (M1),\ (P1)$ respectively and they are Cooperative-plus matrices, then we can write them in following from (i.e.; eigen-decomposition of a positive semi-definite matrix or diagonalization)*

$$A(x) = Q_A^T(x)D_A(x)Q_A(x).$$

$$\Sigma(x) = Q_\Sigma^T(x)D_\Sigma(x)Q_\Sigma(x).$$

$$M(x) = Q_M^T(x)D_M(x)Q_M(x).$$

$$P(x) = Q_P^T(x)D_P(x)Q_P(x).$$

Where $Q_J(x)^T Q_J(x) = I$ ($Q_J^T(x) = Q_J^{-1}(x)$ i.e.; are orthogonal matrix) are the normalized eigenvectors, I is identity matrix, $D_J(x)$ is diagonal matrix in the diagonal of $D_J(x)$ the eigenvalues of $J(x)$ (i.e.; $D(x)_J = diag\left(\lambda_1^J(x), \cdots, \lambda_k^J(x)\right)$) and $J(x) = \{A(x),\ \Sigma(x),\ M(x),\ P(x)\}$

Remark 3.2. *The weight matrices $M(x)$ and $P(x)$ may vanish on subset of positive measure.*

Definition 3.1. *The generalized Steklov-Robin eigensystem is to find a pair* $(\mu, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times H(\Omega)$ *with* $\varphi \not\equiv 0$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega \nabla\varphi.\nabla U\, dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)\varphi, U\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)\varphi, U\rangle\, dx = \\ &\mu\left[\int_\Omega \langle M(x)\varphi, U\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)\varphi, U\rangle\, dx\right] \ \forall\ U \in H(\Omega) \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Remark 3.3. *Let* $U = \varphi$ *in (3.2), if there is such an eigenpair, then* $\mu > 0$ *and*

$$\int_\Omega \langle M(x)\varphi, \varphi\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)\varphi, \varphi\rangle\, dx > 0$$

$$\left(i.e; \sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\int_\Omega m_{ij}(x)\varphi_j\varphi_i\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \rho_{ij}(x)\varphi_j\varphi_i\, dx\right) > 0\right)$$

and

Remark 3.4. *If* $\int_\Omega \langle M(x)\varphi, \varphi\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega}\langle P(x)\varphi, \varphi\rangle\, dx = 0$. *Then*

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2\, dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)\varphi, \varphi\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)\varphi, \varphi\rangle\, dx = 0$$

We have that $\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2\, dx = 0$ *this implies that* $\varphi =$ constant *and* $\int_\Omega \langle A(x)\varphi, \varphi\rangle\, dx = 0$ *this implies that* $A(x) = 0$, *a.e. in* Ω *and* $\int_{\partial\Omega}\langle \Sigma(x)\varphi, \varphi\rangle\, dx = 0$, *then* $\Sigma(x) = 0$ *a.e on* $\partial\Omega$. *So we have that,* φ *would be a constant vector function; which would contradict the assumptions (assumption 1) imposed on* $A(x)$ *and* $\Sigma(x)$

Remark 3.5. *If* $A(x) \equiv 0$ *and* $\Sigma \equiv 0$ *then* $\mu = 0$ *is an eigenvalue of the system (3.1) with eigenfunction* $\varphi =$ constant vector function *on* $\bar{\Omega}$,

It is therefore appropriate to consider the closed linear subspace of $H(\Omega)$ under assumption 1 defined by

$$\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega) := \{U \in H(\Omega) : \int_\Omega \langle M(x)U, U\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, U\rangle\, dx = 0\}.$$

Now all the eigenfunctions associated with (3.2) belongs to the $(A, \Sigma)-$orthogonal complement $H_{(M,P)}(\Omega) := [\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$

$$i.e.; H_{(M,P)}(\Omega) = [\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp =$$

$$\{U \in H(\Omega) : \int_\Omega \langle M(x)U, U\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, U\rangle\, dx > 0 \text{ and } \langle U, V\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = 0, \forall\, V \in \mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)\}$$

of this subspace in $H(\Omega)$

Definition 3.2. $\Omega(M) := \{x \in \Omega : M(x) > 0\}$.
$\partial\Omega(P) := \{x \in \partial\Omega : P(x) > 0\}$.

We will show that indeed the $H_{(M,P)}(\Omega)$ is subspace of $H(\Omega)$. Let $U,\ V \in H_{(M.P)}(\Omega)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we show that $\alpha U \in H_{(M.P)}(\Omega)$ and $U + V \in H_{(M.P)}(\Omega)$

$$\left(\int_\Omega \langle M(x)(\alpha U), \alpha U\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)(\alpha U), \alpha U\rangle\, dx\right) =$$

$$\alpha^2\left(\int_\Omega \langle M(x)U, U\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, U\rangle\, dx\right) =^{U\in H_{(M.P)}} 0$$

Therefore $\alpha U \in H_{(M.P)}(\Omega)$. Now we show that $U+V \in H_{(M.P)}(\Omega)$

$$\int_\Omega \langle M(x)(U+V),(U+V)\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)(U+V),(U+V)\rangle\, dx =$$

$$\int_\Omega \langle M(x)U,U\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U,U\rangle\, dx + \int_\Omega \langle M(x)V,V\rangle\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)V,V\rangle\, dx$$
$$+2\int_\Omega \langle M(x)U,V\rangle\, dx + 2\int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U,V)\rangle\, dx$$

Case 1
If $x \in \partial\Omega(P)$, this implies that $U=0$ on $\partial\Omega(P)$

- $M(x)=0$ on Ω (Steklov problem)
- $M(x)>0$ on set of positive measure of Ω this implies that $U=0$ on Ω
  Now we use and 1, 3.1 we have that

$$0=\int_\Omega \langle M(x)U,U\rangle\, dx = \int_\Omega \langle Q_M^T(x)D_M(x)Q_M(x)U,U\rangle\, dx = \int_\Omega \langle D_M(x)Q_M(x)U,Q_M(x)U\rangle\, dx$$

  Since $D_M(x)>0$ this implies that $Q_M(x)U=0$ since $Q_M(x)$ is invertible this implies that $U=0$ on $\Omega(M)$

Case 2
If $x \in \Omega(M)$, this implies that $U=0$ on Ω

- $P(x)=0$ on $\partial\Omega$ (usual spectrum problem)
- $P(x)>0$ on set of positive measure of $\partial\Omega$ this implies that $U=0$ on $\partial\Omega$
  Now we use and 1, 3.1 we have that

$$0=\int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U,U\rangle\, dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle Q_P^T(x)D_P(x)Q_P(x)U,U\rangle\, dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle D_P(x)Q_P(x)U,Q_P(x)U\rangle\, dx$$

  Since $D_P(x)>0$ this implies that $Q_P(x)U=0$ since $Q_P(x)$ is invertible this implies that $U=0$ on $\Omega(P)$

Therefor $U+V \in \mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)$, so we have that $\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)$ subspace of $H(\Omega)$. So that

$$\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega) := \{U \in H(\Omega) : U=0 \ a.e.;\ \text{in } \Omega(M) \text{ and } \Gamma U = 0 \ a.e.; \text{on } \partial\Omega(P)\}$$

Remark 3.6. .

(1) *If $M(x)\equiv 0$ in Ω and $x\in\partial\Omega(P)$, then the subspace $\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)=H_0(\Omega)$*
(2) *If $P(x)\equiv 0$ in $\partial\Omega$ and $x\in\Omega(M)$, then the subspace $\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)=\{0\}$*

Thus, one can split the Hilbert space $H(\Omega)$ as a driect $(A,\Sigma)-$orthogonal sum in the following way

$$H(\Omega)=\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)\oplus_{(A,\Sigma)}[\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$$

Remark 3.7. *If $(\mu,\varphi)\in\mathbb{R}\times H(\Omega)$ is an eigenpair of 3.2, then it follows from the definition of $H_0(\Omega)$ that*

$$<\varphi,V>_{(A,\Sigma)}=\int_\Omega [\nabla\varphi.\nabla V+\langle A(x)\varphi,V\rangle]\, dx+\int_{\partial\Omega}\langle\Sigma(x)\varphi,V\rangle\, dx=0,$$

$\forall\ V\in\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)$ *that is, $\varphi\in[\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$*

- We shall make use in what follows the real Lebesgue space $L_k^q(\partial\Omega)$ for $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and of the continuity and compactness of the trace operator.

$$\Gamma : H(\Omega) \to L_k^q(\partial\Omega) \ for \ 1 \leq q < \frac{2(n-1)}{n-2}$$

  is well-defined it is a Lebesgue integrable function with respect to Hausdorff $N-1$ dimensional measure, sometime we will just use U in place of ΓU when considering the trace of function on $\partial\Omega$ Throughout this work we denote the $L_N^2(\partial\Omega)-$ inner product by

$$\langle U, V\rangle_\partial := \int_{\partial\Omega} U.V \, dx$$

  and the associated norm by

$$||U||_\partial^2 := \int_{\partial\Omega} U.U \ \forall U, V \in H(\Omega)$$

  (see [KJF1997], [Neč1967] and the references therein for more details)
- The trace mapping $\Gamma : H(\Omega) \to L_N^2(\partial\Omega)$ is compact (see [Gri1985])
-

$$\langle U, V\rangle_{(M,P)} = \int_\Omega \langle M(x)U, V\rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, V\rangle \, dx \tag{3.3}$$

  defines an inner product for $H(\Omega)$, with associated norm

$$||U||_{(M,P)}^2 := \int_\Omega \langle M(x)U, U\rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, U\rangle \, dx \tag{3.4}$$

4. Preliminary Results

In this section we study some auxiliary results, which will be need in the sequel for the proof of our main results. Using the Hölder inequality, the continuity of the trace operator, the Sobolev embedding theorem and lower semicontinuity of $||.||_{(A,\Sigma)}$, we deduce that $||.||_{(A,\Sigma)}$ (see (2.1)) is equivalent to standard norm $H(\Omega)-$norm. This observation enables us to prove the existence of an unbounded and discrete spectrum for the Steklov-Robin eigensystem (3.1), and discuss some of its properties.

Definition 4.1. *Define the functionals*

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma} : H(\Omega) \to [0, \infty)$$

defined by

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U) := \int_\Omega \left[\nabla U.\nabla U + \langle A(x)U, U\rangle\right] \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle \, dx = ||U||_{(A\Sigma)}^2, \ \forall \ U \in H(\Omega)$$

$$\Upsilon_{M,P} : H(\Omega) \to [1, \infty)$$

defined by

$$\Upsilon_{M,P} := \int_\Omega \langle M(x)U, U\rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, U\rangle \, dx - 1 = ||U||_{(M,P)}^2 - 1, \ \forall \ U \in H(\Omega)$$

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose* $(A2, \ S2, \ C1 - C3)$, *and assumption1 are holds then the functionals* $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ *and* $\Upsilon_{M,P}$ *are* C^1- *functional (i.e.; continuous differentiable)*

Proof. We compute $\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)V$. Let $U, V \in H(\Omega)$ We have that

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U+tV) = \int_\Omega |\nabla(U+tV)|^2\,dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)(U+tV), U+tV\rangle\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)(U+tV), U+tV\rangle\,dx =$$

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla U|^2 + 2t\nabla U.\nabla V\,dx + t^2|\nabla V|^2)\,dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)U, U\rangle\,dx + 2t\int_\Omega \langle A(x)U, V\rangle\,dx + t^2\int_\Omega \langle A(x)V, V\rangle\,dx +$$

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle + 2t < \Sigma U, V\rangle + t^2\langle \Sigma(x)V, V\rangle\,dx$$

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U) = \int_\Omega |\nabla U|^2\,dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)U, U\rangle\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle\,dx,$$

$$\lim_{t\to 0} t^{-1}[(\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U+tV) - \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)] =$$

$$2\left(\int_\Omega \nabla U.\nabla V\,dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)U, V\rangle\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma U, V\rangle\,dx\right). \tag{4.1}$$

$$\therefore \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)V = 2\langle U, V\rangle_{(A,\Sigma)},\ \forall\ U, V \in H(\Omega)$$

Now you compute $\Upsilon'_{M,P}(U)V$, let $U, V \in H(\Omega)$

$$\Upsilon_{M,P}(U+tV) = \int_\Omega \langle M(x)(U+tV), U+tv\rangle\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)(U+tV), U+tV\rangle\,dx - 1 =$$

$$t\int_\Omega \langle M(x)U, U\rangle\,dx + 2t\int_\Omega \langle M(x)U, V\rangle\,dx + t^2\int_\Omega \langle M(x)V, V\rangle\,dx$$

$$+ \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, U\rangle\,dx + 2t\int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, V\rangle\,dx + t^2\int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)V, V\rangle\,dx - 1.$$

$$\lim_{t\to 0} t^{-1}[\Upsilon_{M,P}(U+tV) - \Upsilon_{M,P}(U)] = 2\langle U, V\rangle_{M,P} \therefore \Upsilon'_{M,P}(U)V = 2\langle U, V\rangle_{M,P},\ \forall\ U, V \in H(\Omega) \tag{4.2}$$

Now we will prove that $\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)V,\ \Upsilon'_{M,P}(U)V$ are continuous functionals.
Let $U_l \to U$ in $H(\Omega)$, we show that $||\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U_l) - \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)||_{\mathbb{L}(H(\Omega),\mathbb{R})} \to 0$ as $l \to \infty$, and $||\Upsilon'_{M,P}(U_l) - \Upsilon'_{M,P}(U)||_{\mathbb{L}(H(\Omega),\mathbb{R})} \to 0$ as $l \to \infty$ where

$$\mathbb{L}(H(\Omega), \mathbb{R}) := \{\xi : H(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R} : \xi \in C(H(\Omega), \mathbf{R})\}$$

i.e.; $\mathbb{L}(H(\Omega), \mathbb{R})$ the set of all continuous functional from $H(\Omega)$ to $\mathbb{R}$, since we know that

$$||\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U_l) - \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)||_{\mathbb{L}(H(\Omega),\mathbb{R})} = \sup_{||V||_{(A,\Sigma)}=1} |\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U_l)V - \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)V|,\ \forall\ U, V \in H(\Omega)$$

$$|\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U_l)V - \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)V| =$$

$$2\left|\left(\int_\Omega \nabla U_l.\nabla V\,dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)U_l, V\rangle\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega}\langle \Sigma U_l, V\rangle\,dx\right) - \left(\int_\Omega \nabla U.\nabla V\,dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)U, V\rangle\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega}\langle \Sigma U, V\rangle\,dx\right)\right|$$

$$|\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U_l)V - \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)V| \leq$$

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla U_l - \nabla U|.|\nabla V|\,dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)(U_l - U), V\rangle|\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} |\langle \Sigma(U_l - U), V\rangle|\,dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega |\nabla U_l - \nabla U|.|\nabla V|\,dx + \int_\Omega |\sum_{i=1}^k (A(x)(U_l - U))_j v_i|\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} |\sum_{i=1}^k (\Sigma(U_l - U))_j v_i|\,dx$$

$$\leq \int_\Omega |\nabla U_l - \nabla U|.|\nabla V|\,dx + \int_\Omega \sum_{i=1}^k |(A(x)(U_l - U))_j v_i|\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^k |(\Sigma(U_l - U))_j v_i|\,dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega |\nabla U_l - \nabla U|.|\nabla V|\,dx + \sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_\Omega |(A(x)(U_l - U))_j v_i|\,dx + \sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial\Omega} |(\Sigma(U_l - U))_j v_i|\,dx$$

Where

$$(A(x)(U_l - U))_j = \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{ij}(x)(u_{lj} - u_j)$$

, and

$$(\Sigma(x)(U_l - U))_j = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sigma_{ij}(x)(u_{lj} - u_j)$$

where $U = \{u_1 \cdots, u_k\}$, $U_l = \{u_{l1} \cdots, u_{lk}\}$, and $V = \{v_1 \cdots, v_k\}$ so we have that

$$\frac{1}{2}|\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U_k)V - \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)V| \leq$$

$$\leq \int_\Omega |\nabla U_l - \nabla U|.|\nabla V|\,dx$$

$$+\sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_\Omega |a_{ij}(x)(u_{lj} - u_j)v_i|\,dx + \sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial\Omega} |\sigma_{ij}(x)(u_{lj} - u_j)v_i|\,dx$$

$$\leq^{Holder\ inequality} \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla U_l - \nabla U|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} . \left(\int_\Omega ||\nabla V|^2\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$+\sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\int_\Omega |a_{ij}(x)||(u_{lj} - u_j)|^2\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_\Omega |a_{ij}(x)|v_i|^2\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$+\sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\int_{\partial\Omega} \sigma_{ij}(x)|u_{lj} - u_j|^2\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\partial\Omega} \sigma_{ij}(x)|v_i|^2\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

So we have that

$$|\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U_l)V - \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)V| \leq 2||U_l - U||_{(A,\Sigma)}||V||_{(A,\Sigma)} \to 0,\ \text{as } l \to \infty$$

then, $||\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U_l) - \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)||_{\mathbb{L}(H(\Omega),\mathbb{R})} \to 0$ as $l \to \infty$ so that $\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)$ is continuous functional. similar argument we can prove that $\Upsilon'_{M,P}(U)V$ is continuous functional. □

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose* $(A2, S2, C1-C3)$*, and assumption1 are holds then the functional* $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ *is convex.*

Proof.

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(tU + (1-t)V) = ||tU + (1-t)V)||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} \leq \left(||tU||_{(A,\Sigma)} + ||(1-t)V)||_{(A,\Sigma)}\right)^2$$

$$\leq t^2||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + 2t(1-t)||U||_{(A,\Sigma)}||V||_{(A,\Sigma)} + (1-t)^2||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

$$\leq t^2||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + t(1-t)\left[||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + ||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}\right] + (1-t)^2||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

$$\leq t^2||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + t||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} - t^2||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + t||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}) - t^2||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + ||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} - 2t||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + t^2||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

$$= t||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} - t||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + ||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = t||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + (1-t)||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = t\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U) + (1-t)\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(V)$$

□

Lemma 4.3. $\forall\ U, V \in H(\Omega)$*, then* $\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)(V - U) \leq \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(V) - \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)$

Proof. Since $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ is convex from Lemma4.2

$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(tV+(1-t)U) = \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U+t(V-U)) \leq \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)+t(\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(V)-\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U))\forall\, U,V \in H(\Omega),\ \forall\, t \in (0,1)$

$$\frac{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U+t(V-U)) - \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)}{t} \leq +\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(V)-\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)\forall\, U,V \in H(\Omega),\ \forall\, t \in (0,1)$$

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U+t(V-U)) - \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)}{t} \leq +\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(V)-\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)\forall\, U,V \in H(\Omega),\ \forall\, t \in (0,1)$$

so we have that

$$\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)(V-U) \leq \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(V) - \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)\ \forall\ U,V \in H(\Omega).$$

□

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ be $G-$differentiable and convex, then $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ is weakly lower-semi-continuous*

Proof. Let $U_l \rightharpoonup U$ in $H(\Omega)$ since $\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}$ continuous then $\lim_{l\to\infty}\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)'(U_l) = \Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)(U)$ by 4.3 we have that

$$\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)(U_l-U) \leq \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U_l) - \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)$$

so we have that

$$\liminf_{l\to\infty}\Lambda'_{A,\Sigma}(U)(U_l-U) \leq \liminf_{l\to\infty}(\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U_l) - \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U))$$

since the limit of the left hand side exist and equal zero then we get that

$$0 \leq \liminf_{l\to\infty}(\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U_l) - \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U))$$

so we have that

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U) \leq \liminf_{l\to\infty}\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U_l)$$

Therefore $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ is weakly lower-semi-continuous □

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that (A1,S1,C1-C3) holds, then*

(i) *There exists $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$||U||_{(M,P)} \leq \sqrt{\delta^{-1}}||U||_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

(ii) *The norms $||.||_H(\Omega)$ and $||.||_{(A,\Sigma)}$ are equivalents in $H(\Omega)$*

Proof. Define

$$\mathbb{S} := \{U \in H(\Omega) : ||U||_{(M,P)} = 1\}$$

and

$$\delta := \inf_{U\in\mathbb{S}}||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = \inf_{U\in\mathbb{S}}\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)^2$$

Claim 4.1. *There exists $\hat{\mathrm{U}} \in \mathbb{S}$ such that*

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(\hat{\mathrm{U}}) = ||\hat{\mathrm{U}}||_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sqrt{\delta}$$

By the definition of δ, there exists sequence $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathbb{S}$ such that

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U_n) \to \sqrt{\delta} \text{ and } \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U_n) < \sqrt{\delta}+1$$

Since $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathbb{S}$ the sequence $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded in $(H(\Omega)), ||.||_H$ which implies that exist a subsequence $\{U_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\hat{\mathrm{U}}$ such that $U_{n_k} \rightharpoonup \hat{\mathrm{U}}$ weakly in $(H(\Omega)), ||.||_H$. Consequently, from the compact embedding of $H^1(\Omega)$ into $L^2(\Omega)$, we

that $U_{n_k} \to \hat{\mathrm{U}}$ *in* $(L^2_N(\Omega)), ||.||_{L^2_N}$ *where* $||U||_{L^2_N} := \sum_{i=1}^N ||u_i||_{L^2(\Omega)}$. *Thus* $\hat{\mathrm{U}} \in \mathbb{S}$. *Furthermore, it follows from Lemma(**??**) that*

$$||\hat{\mathrm{U}}||_{(A,\Sigma)} \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} ||U_{n_k}||_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sqrt{\delta}$$

Therefore

$$||\hat{\mathrm{U}}||_{(A,\Sigma)} \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} ||U_{n_k}||_{(A,\Sigma)} \leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} ||U_{n_k}||_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

since we know that

$$\sqrt{\delta} = \liminf_{k\to\infty} ||U_{n_k}||_{(A,\Sigma)} = \limsup_{k\to\infty} ||U_{n_k}||_{(A,\Sigma)} = \lim_{k\to\infty} ||U_{n_k}||_{(A,\Sigma)} = ||\hat{\mathrm{U}}||_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

Thus

$$\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(\hat{\mathrm{U}}) = \sqrt{\delta}$$

Claim 4.2.

$$\delta > 0$$

Clarey, $\delta \geq$. *If* $\delta = 0$, *then* $||\hat{\mathrm{U}}||_{(A,\Sigma)} = 0$ *and thus* $\hat{\mathrm{U}} = 0$, *which contradicts the assumption that* $\hat{\mathrm{U}} \in \mathbb{S}$. *Therefore* $\delta > 0$

Since every $W \in H(\Omega)$ can be written as $W = \frac{U}{||U||_{(M,P)}}$ for all $U \in H(\Omega)$ so that $||W||_{(A,\Sigma)} = \frac{||U||_{(A,\Sigma)}}{||U||_{(M,P)}}$ Since $W \in H(\Omega)$, so that $||W||_{(A,\Sigma)} = \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(W) \geq \sqrt{\delta}$. so we have that

$$\sqrt{\delta} \leq \frac{||U||_{(A,\Sigma}}{||U||_{(M,P)}}$$

It follows from claim 4.1 and claim4.2, then

$$||U||_{(M,P)} \leq \sqrt{\delta^{-1}}||U||_{(A,\Sigma)} \ \forall\ U \in H(\Omega)$$

The proof of the norms $||.||_H(\Omega)$ and $||.||_{(A,\Sigma)}$ are equivalents in $H(\Omega)$, by continuity of $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ there exists a constant $\xi > 0$ such that

$$||U||_{(A,\Sigma)} \leq \sqrt{\xi}||U||_{H(\Omega)} \ \forall\ U \in H(\Omega).$$

We have that

$$||U||^2_{H(\Omega)} \leq ||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + ||U||^2_{(M,P)},$$

we get that

$$||U||_{H(\Omega)} \leq \left(||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} + ||U||^2_{(M,P)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Therefore by the first part we have that

$$||U||_{H(\Omega)} \leq \left((1+\delta^{-1})||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

we get that

$$||U||_{H(\Omega)} \leq \left(1+\delta^{-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ||U||_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

Therefore

$$||U||_{H(\Omega)} \leq \sqrt{1+\delta^{-1}}||U||_{(A,\Sigma)} \ \forall\ U \in H(\Omega)$$

So we get that

$$\sqrt{\xi^{-1}}||U||_{(A,\Sigma)} \leq ||U||_{H(\Omega)} \leq \sqrt{1+\delta^{-1}}||U||_{(A,\Sigma)} \ \forall\ U \in H(\Omega)$$

The equivalences desired □

5. Main theorem

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that $A2, S2, C1-C3$ as above. Then we have the following.*

- **i:** *The eigensystem* (3.1) *has a sequence of real eigenvalues*

$$0 < \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 \leq \cdots \leq \mu_j \leq \cdots \to \infty \text{ as } j \to \infty$$

  each eigenvalue has a finite-dimensional eigenspace.
- **ii:** *The eigenfunctions φ_j corresponding to the eigenvalues μ_j from an $(A,\Sigma)-$orthogonal and $(M,P)-$orthonormal family in $[\mathbb{H}_{M,P}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$ (a closed subspace of $H(\Omega)$*
- **iii:** *The normalized eigenfunctions provide a complete $(A,\Sigma)-$orthonormal basis of $[\mathbb{H}_{M,P}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$. Moreover, each function in $U \in [\mathbb{H}_{M,P}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$ has a unique representation of the from*

$$\begin{gathered} U = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \varphi_j \text{ with } c_j := \frac{1}{\mu_j} \langle U, \varphi_j \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} =< U, \varphi_j >_{(M.P)} \\ ||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j |c_j|^2 \end{gathered} \tag{5.1}$$

  In addition,

$$||U||^2_{(M,P)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |c_j|^2$$

Proof. We will prove the existence of a sequence of real eigenvalues μ_j and the eigenfunctions φ_j corresponding to the eigenvalues that from an orthogonal family in $[\mathbb{H}_{M,P}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$
We show that $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ attains its minimum on the constraint set

$$W_0 = \{U \in [\mathbb{H}_{M,P}(\Omega)]^{\perp} : \Upsilon_{M,P}(U) = 0\}$$

Let $\alpha := \inf_{U \in W_0}$, by using the continuity of the trace operator, the Sobolev embedding theorem and the lower-semi-continuity of $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$.
Let $\{U_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ be a minimizing sequence in W_0 for $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$, since $\lim_{l\to\infty} \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U_l) = \alpha$, we have that $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U_l) = ||U_l||_{(A,\Sigma)}$, by the definition of α we have that for all sufficiently large l, and for all $\epsilon > 0$, then $||U_l||^2_{A,\Sigma} \leq \alpha + \epsilon$ by using the equivalent norm (See lemma4.4) we have that there is exist β such that

$$||U_l||^2_{H(\Omega)} \leq \beta ||U_l||^2_{A,\Sigma}$$

so we have that

$$||U_l||^2_{H(\Omega)} \leq \beta ||U_l||^2_{A,\Sigma} \leq \beta(\alpha + \epsilon),$$

so this sequence is bounded in $H^{(}\Omega)$. Thus it has a weakly convergent subsequence $\{U_{l_j} : j \geq 1\}$ which convergent weakly to limit $\hat{U}$ in $H(\Omega)$. From Rellich-Kondrachov theorem this subsequence convergent strongly to $\hat{U}$ in $L^2_k(\Omega)$, so $\hat{U}$ in W_0. Thus $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(\hat{U}) = \alpha$ as the functional is weakly l.s.c. (see Theorem4.1)

Then there exists φ_1 such that $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(\varphi_1) = \alpha$. Hence, $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}$ attains its minimum at φ_1 and φ_1 satisfies the following

$$\int_\Omega \nabla.\varphi_1 \nabla V \, dx + \int_\Omega \langle A(x)\varphi_1, V\rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)\varphi_1, V\rangle = \mu_1 \left(\int_\Omega \langle M(x)\varphi_1, V\rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)\varphi_1, V\rangle \, dx \right) \tag{5.2}$$

For all $V \in [\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$ We see that (μ_1, φ_1) satisfies equation (3.2) in weak sense and $\varphi_1 \in W_0$ this implies that $\varphi_1 \in [\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$ by the definition of W_0, Now take $V = \varphi_1$ in equation (5.2), we obtain that the eigenvalue μ_1 is the infimum $\alpha = \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(\varphi_1) = \mu_1$. This means that we could define μ_1 by Rayleigh quotient

$$\mu_1 = \inf_{\substack{U \in H(\Omega) \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)}{||U||^2_{(M,P)}}$$

Clearly, $\mu_1 = \Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(\varphi_1) \geq 0$. Indeed assume that $\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(\varphi_1) = 0$ then $|\nabla\varphi_1| = 0$ on Ω , hence φ_1 must be a constant that contradicts the assumptions imposed on $A(x)$. Thus $\mu_1 > 0$.

Now we show the existence of higher eigenvalues.
Define

$$\mathbb{F}_1 : W_0 \to \mathbb{R} \text{ by } \mathbb{F}_1(U) = \langle U, \varphi_1\rangle_{M,P}$$

we know that the kernel of $\mathbb{F}_1$

$$ker\mathbb{F}_1 = \{U \in W_0 : \mathbb{F}_1(U) = 0\} =: W_1.$$

Since W_1 is the null-space of the continuous functional $\langle ., \varphi_1\rangle_{M,P}$ on $[\mathbb{H}_{(M.P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$, W_1 is a closed subspace of $[\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$, and it is therefore a Hilbert space itself under the same inner product $< ., . >_{(M,P)}$. Now we define

$$\mu_2 = \inf\{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U) : U \in W_1\} = \inf_{\substack{U \in W_1 \\ U \neq 0}} \frac{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)}{||U||^2_{(M,P)}}$$

Since $W_1 \subset W_0$ then we have that $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$. Now we define

$$\mathbb{F}_2 : W_1 \to \mathbb{R} \text{ by } \mathbb{F}_2(U) = \langle U, \varphi_2\rangle_{M,P}$$

we know that the kernel of $\mathbb{F}_2$

$$ker\mathbb{F}_2 = \{U \in W_1 : \mathbb{F}_2(U) = 0\} =: W_2.$$

Since W_2 is the null-space of the continuous functional $\langle ., \varphi_2\rangle_{M,P}$ on $[\mathbb{H}_{(M.P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$, W_2 is a closed subspace of $[\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$, and it is therefore a Hilbert space itself under the same inner product $< ., . >_{(M,P)}$. Now we define

$$\mu_3 = \inf\{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U) : U \in W_2\} = \inf_{\substack{U \in W_2 \\ U \neq 0}} \frac{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)}{||U||^2_{(M,P)}}$$

Since $W_2 \subset W_1$ then we have that $\mu_2 \leq \mu_3$.

Moreover, we can repeat the above arguments to show that μ_3 is achieved at some $\varphi_3 \in [\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^\perp$.
We let

$$W_3 = \{u \in W_2 :< U, \varphi_3 >_{(M,P)} = 0\},$$

and

$$\mu_4 = \inf\{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U) : U \in W_3\} = \inf_{\substack{U\in W_3\\ u\neq 0}} \frac{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)}{||U||^2_{(M,P)}}$$

Since $W_3 \subset W_2$ then we have that $\mu_3 \leq \mu_4$. Moreover, we can repeat the above arguments to show that μ_4 is achieved at some $\varphi_4 \in [\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$.
Proceeding inductively, (In general we can define

$$\mathbb{F}_j : W_{j-1} \to \mathbb{R} \text{ by } \mathbb{F}_j(U) = \langle U, \varphi_j\rangle_{M,P}$$

we know that the kernel of $\mathbb{F}_2$

$$ker\mathbb{F}_j = \{U \in W_{j-1} : \mathbb{F}_j(U) = 0\} =: W_j.$$

Since W_j is the null-space of the continuous functional $\langle ., \varphi_j\rangle_{M,P}$ on $[\mathbb{H}_{(M.P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$, W_j is a closed subspace of $[\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$, and it is therefore a Hilbert space itself under the same inner product $< ., . >_{(M,P)}$. Now we define

$$\mu_{j+1} = \inf\{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U) : U \in W_j\} = \inf_{\substack{U\in W_j\\ U\neq 0}} \frac{\Lambda_{A,\Sigma}(U)}{||U||^2_{(M,P)}}$$

In this way, we generate a sequence of eigenvalues

$$0 < \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 \leq \ldots \leq \mu_j \leq \ldots$$

whose associated φ_j are $c-$orthogonal and $(M, P)-$orthonormal in $[H^1_0(\Omega)]^{\perp}$
Claim 1 $\mu_j \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$

Proof. By way of contradiction, assume that the sequence is bounded above by constant. Therefore, the corresponding sequence of eigenfunctions φ_j is bounded in $H(\Omega)$ (i.e.; by the definition of the limit at ∞ $\forall$ $S > 0$, $\exists N > 0$ such that $|\varphi_j| > S$, whenever $j > N$, the ignition of the statement $\exists S > 0$ such that $|\varphi_j| \leq S$ $\forall j$). By Rellich-Kondrachov theorem and the compactness of the trace operator, there is a Cauchy subsequence (which we again denote by φ_j such that

$$||\varphi_j - \varphi_k||^2_{(M,P)} \to 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Since the φ_j are $(M, P)-$orthonormal, we have that $||\varphi_j - \varphi_k||^2_{(M,P)} = ||\varphi_j||^2_{(M,P)} + ||\varphi_k||^2_{(M.P)} = 2 > 0$, if$j \neq k$, which contradicts equation (5.3). Thus, $\mu_j \to \infty$. we have that each μ_j occurs only finitely many times. □

Claim 2 Each eigenvalue μ_j has a finite-dimensional eigenspace.

Proof. By way of contradiction, assume that each eigenvalue μ_j has infinite-dimensional eigenspace. let μ has corresponding sequence of eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, ..., \varphi_j, ...\}$ we know that $\mu = ||\varphi_1||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = ... = ||\varphi_j||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = ...$, this contradicts claim 1 therefore, each eigenvalue has a finite-dimensional eigenspace

□

We will show that the normalized eigenfunctions provide a complete orthonormal basis of $[H^1_0(\Omega)]^{\perp}$. Let

$$\psi_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}}\varphi_j,$$

so that $||\psi_j||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = 1$
Claim 3 The sequence $\{\psi_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a maximal $(A, \Sigma)-$orthonormal family of $[\mathbb{H}_{(M.P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$.

(we know that the set maximal $(A,\Sigma)-$orthonormal if and only if it is complete orthonormal basis)

Proof. By way of contradiction, assume that the sequence $\{\psi_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ is not maximal, then there exists a $\xi \in [\mathbb{H}_{(M.P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$, and $\xi \notin \{\psi_j\}_{j\geq 1}$, such that $||\xi||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = 1$ and $< \xi, \psi_j >_c = 0 \ \forall \ j$, i.e.;

$$0 = \langle \xi, \psi_j \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = \langle \xi, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \varphi_j \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} =$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \langle \xi, \varphi_j \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} =^{(\ by\ 5.2)} \frac{\mu_j}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \langle \xi, \varphi_j \rangle_{(M,P)} = \mu_j \langle \xi, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \varphi_j \rangle_{(M,P)} = \mu_j < \xi, \psi_j >_{\partial},$$

since $\mu_j > 0 \ \forall \ j$. Therefore $\langle \xi, \psi_j \rangle_{(M.P)} = 0$. We have that $\xi \in W_j \ \forall \ j \geq 1$. It follows from the definition of μ_j that

$$\mu_j \leq \frac{||\xi||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}}{||\xi||^2_{(M,P)}} = \frac{1}{||\xi||^2_{(M,P)}} \ \forall \ j \geq 1.$$

Since we know from claim 1 that $\mu_j \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$ we have that $||\xi||^2_{(M,P)} = 0$. Therefore $\xi = 0$ a.e in Ω, which contradicts the definition of ξ. Thus the sequence $\{\psi_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a maximal $(A,\Sigma)-$orthonormal family of $[H_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$, so the sequence $\{\psi_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ provides a complete orthonormal basis of $[H_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$; that is, for any $U \in [\mathbb{H}_{(A,\Sigma)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$,

$$U = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} d_j \psi_j \text{ with } d_j = \langle U, \psi_j \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \langle U, \varphi_j \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)}, \text{ and } ||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |d_j|^2$$

$$U = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} d_j \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \varphi_j,$$

now let

$$c_j = d_j \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} = \frac{1}{\mu_j} \langle U, \varphi_j \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} =^{(5.2)} \langle U, \varphi_j \rangle_{(M,P)}.$$

Therefore,

$$U = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \varphi_j,$$

and

$$||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |c_j|^2 ||\varphi_j||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j |c_j|^2$$

□

Claim 4 We shall show that

$$||U||^2_{(M.P)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |c_j|^2$$

Proof.

$$||U||^2_{(M,P)} =< u, u >_{(M,P)}= \langle \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j\varphi_j, \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k\varphi_k\rangle_{(M,P)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k\langle\varphi_j, \varphi_k\rangle_{(M,P)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |c_j|^2.$$

Thus

$$||U||^2_{(M,P)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |c_j|^2$$

□

The following result gives a variational characterization of the eigenvalues and a splitting of the space $[\mathbb{H}_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$, (and, hence, of $H(\Omega)$ which will be needed in the proofs of the result on nonlinear problems.

Corollary 1 Assume that $A1, A2, S1, S2, M1, P1$ and assumption1, holds. Then we have the following.

i: For all $U \in H(\Omega)$,

$$\mu_1 \left(\int_{\Omega} \langle M(x)U, U\rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle P(x)U, U\rangle \, dx \right) \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla U|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x)U, U\rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \Sigma(x)U, U\rangle \, dx, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\mu_1 > 0$ is the least Steklov-Robin eigenvalue for system (3.1). If equality holds in (5.4), then U is a multiple of an eigenfunction of equation (3.1) corresponding to μ_1

ii: For every $V \in \oplus_{i\leq j} E(\mu_i)$, and $W \in \oplus_{i\geq j+1} E(\mu_i)$, we have that

$$||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} \leq \mu_j ||V||^2_{(M.P)} \text{ and } ||W||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} \geq \mu_{j+1} ||W||^2_{(M,P)} \tag{5.5}$$

where $E(\mu_i)$ is the μ_i-eigenspace and $\oplus_{i\leq j} E(\mu_i)$ is span of the eigenfunctions associated to eigenvalues up to μ_j

Proof. If $U = 0$, then the inequality (5.4) holds. otherwise, if $0 \neq U \in H(\Omega)$, then $U = U_1 + U_2$, where $U_1 \in [H_{(M,P)}(\Omega)]^{\perp}$, and $U_2 \in H_{(M,P)}(\Omega)$. Therefore, by the $(A, \Sigma)-$orthogonality, and the characterization of μ_1 (i.e.; $\mu_1 ||U_1||^2_{(M,P)} \leq ||u_1||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}$) we get that

$$\mu_1 ||U||^2_{(M,P)} = \mu_1 \left(||U_1||^2_{(M,P)} + \cancelto{0}{||U_2||^2_{(M,P)}} \right) \leq ||U_1||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} \leq ||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}$$

. Thus, the inequality (5.4) holds.
Now assume we have that

$$||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = \mu_1 ||U||^2_{(M,P)} \implies \mu_1 = \frac{||U||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}}{||u||^2_{(M,P)}}$$

we know that $\mu_1 = \frac{||\varphi_1||^2_{(A,\Sigma)}}{||\varphi_1||^2_{(M,P)}}$, where φ_1 the eigenfunction corresponding to μ_1, Therefore, U is a multiple of an eigenfunction of system (3.1) corresponding to μ_1. The inequalities (5.4) by Theorem5.1 we have that

$$||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_i |c_i|^2 \ \forall \ V \in \oplus_{i\leq j} E(\mu_i)$$

. Now let $\mu_j = \max \mu \ \forall i \leq j$, then we have that

$$||V||^2_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_i |c_i|^2 \leq \max \mu \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |c_i|^2 = \mu_j ||v||^2_{(M,P)} \ \forall \ V \in \oplus_{i \leq j} E(\mu_i)$$

$$||W||^{(A,\Sigma)}_c = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j |c_j|^2 \ \forall W \in \oplus_{i \leq j} E(\mu_i)$$

. Now let $\mu_{j+1} = \min \mu \ \forall \ i \geq j+1$, then we have that

$$||W||_{(A,\Sigma)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j |c_j|^2 \geq \min \mu \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |c_j|^2 = \mu_{j+1} ||w||^2_{(M,P)} \ \forall \ W \in \oplus_{i \geq j+1} E(\mu_i)$$

□

The following proposition shows the principality of the first eigenvalue μ_1.

Proposition 5.2. *The first eigenvalue μ_1 is simple if and only if the associated eigenfunction φ_1 does not changes sign (i.e.; φ_1 is strictly positive or strictly negative in Ω .*

Proof. Assume that the first eigenvalue μ_1 is simple, we will show that associated eigenfunction φ_1 does not changes sign in Ω, suppose it does and let $\varphi_1 = \varphi_1^+ + \varphi_1^-$, where $\varphi_1^+ = \max\{\varphi_1, 0\}$, and $\varphi_1^- = \min\{0, \varphi_1\}$
If $\varphi_1 \in H(\Omega)$. Then $\varphi_1^+, \varphi_1^- \in H^1(\Omega)$ proof of that we know that $\varphi_1^+ = \frac{1}{2}(\varphi_1 + |\varphi_1|)$ clearly $\varphi_1^+ \in L^2_k(\Omega)$, define

$$V_\epsilon = (\varphi_1^2 + \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \epsilon$$
$$|\varphi_1| = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} V_\epsilon,$$

we will show that

$$D^i V_\epsilon = \frac{\varphi_1}{(\varphi_1^2 + \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} D_i \varphi_1 \longrightarrow^{L^2_k(\Omega)} \ sign D^i \varphi_1$$

$\forall \epsilon > 0$, then $0 \leq V_\epsilon \leq |\varphi_1|$ since

$$V_\epsilon^2 = \left((\varphi_1^2 + \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \epsilon\right)^2 = \varphi_1^2 + \epsilon^2 - 2(\varphi_1^2 + \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon + \epsilon^2 = \varphi_1^2 + 2\epsilon(\epsilon - (\varphi_1^2 + \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \varphi_1^2,$$

therefore $V_\epsilon \leq |\varphi_1|$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} || \frac{\varphi_1}{(\varphi_1^2 + \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} D_i \varphi_1 - sign D^i \varphi_1 ||_{L^2_k(\Omega)} = 0$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\varphi_1}{(\varphi_1^2 + \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} D_i \varphi_1 \longrightarrow^{L^2_k(\Omega)} \ sign D^i \varphi_1$$

Thus, $\varphi_1^+ \in H^1(\Omega)$, similar $\varphi_1^- \in H^1(\Omega)$
By the characterization of μ_1 it follows that

$$\langle \varphi_1, \varphi_1 \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} = \mu_1 \langle \varphi_1, \varphi_1 \rangle_{(M,P)},$$

since $\varphi_1^+ \in H(\Omega)$, and $\varphi_1^- \in H(\Omega)$, we have that

$$\mu_1 \langle \varphi_1^+, \varphi_1^+ \rangle_{(M,P)} \leq \langle \varphi_1^+, \varphi_1^+ \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)},$$
$$\mu_1 \langle \varphi_1^-, \varphi_1^- \rangle_{(M,P)} \leq \langle \varphi_1^-, \varphi_1^- \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)}.$$

Therefore

$$0 \leq \langle \varphi_1^+, \varphi_1^+ \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} + \langle \varphi_1^-, \varphi_1^- \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} - \mu_1 \langle \varphi_1^+, \varphi_1^+ \rangle_{(M,P)} - \mu_1 \langle \varphi_1^-, \varphi_1^- \rangle_{(M,P)} =$$
$$\langle \varphi_1^+ + \varphi_1^-, \varphi_1^+ + \varphi_1^- \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} - \mu_1 \langle \varphi_1^+ + \varphi_1^-, \varphi_1^+ + \varphi_1^- \rangle_{(M,P)} = \langle \varphi_1, \varphi_1 \rangle_{(A,\Sigma)} - \mu_1 \langle \varphi_1, \varphi_1 \rangle_{(M,P)} = 0.$$

It follows that φ_1^+, and φ_1^- are also eigenfunctions corresponding to μ_1 we have that $\varphi_1^+ > 0$ *a.e in* Ω, and $\varphi_1^- < 0$ *a.e in* Ω, which is impossible since μ_1 it is simple. Thus φ_1 does not change sign in Ω.

Assume φ_1 change sign, then φ_1^+, and φ_1^- are also eigenfunctions corresponding to μ_1 and they are linearly independent. Hence, μ_1 is not simple. On the other hand, suppose that μ_1 is not simple, and let φ and ψ be two eigenfunctions corresponding to μ_1 they are linearly independent. If φ or ψ changes sign, then the proposition is proved. Otherwise, supposing without loss of generality that φ and ψ positive, we will prove that there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the eigenfunction (corresponding to μ_1) $\varphi + a\psi$ changes sign. Indeed, suppose that, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi + \alpha\psi$ does not change.

Let the function $h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be define by

$$h(\alpha) = \int \varphi + \alpha \int \psi.$$

Since h is continuous, there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$h(a) = \int \varphi + a \int \psi = 0.$$

Hence, which contradicts the fact φ and ψ, are linearly independent. Thus, $\varphi + a\psi$, changes sign. The proof is complete. □

Remark 5.3. *Note that if we have smooth data and $\partial\Omega$ in proposition 5.2, then the eigenfunction $\varphi_1(x)$ on $\partial\Omega$ as well, by the boundary point lemma (see for example* [**?**]*). or Hopf's Boundary Point Lemma.*

□

References

[Auc2012] G. Auchmuty.*Bases and comparison results for liear elliptic eigenproblems, Journal Math. Anal.Appl. 390(2012) 394-406*

[Eva99] L.C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998.*

[EG1992] L.C. Evans,R.F Gariepy *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions, CRC Press, 1992, first printing*

[GMR2013] J.D.B de Godoi, O.H. Miyagaki, R.S.Rodrigues *Steklov-Neumann eigenvalue problems for a class of elliptic system, SP-Brazil 2013*

[Gri1985] P. Grisvard *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains, Pitman, Boston, 1985*

[KJF1997] A. Kufiner, O. John and S. Fučik *Functions spaces, Leyden:Noordhoff, 1977.*

[Mav2012] N. Mavinga *Generalized eigenproblems and nonlinear elliptic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. Proceedings of the Royal of Edinburgh, 142A,137-153,2012*

[MN2010] N. Mavinga and M. N. Nkashama. *Steklov–Neumann eigenproblems and nonlinear elliptic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. J. Diff. Eqns 248 (2010), 1212–1229.*

[MN2011] N. Mavinga and M. N. Nkashama. Nonresonance on the boundary and strong solutions of elliptic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. Journal of Applied Functional Analysis,Vol.7,No3,243,257,2011.

[MN2012] N. Mavinga, M. N. Nkashama; *Nonresonance on the boundary and strong solutions of elliptic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. Journal of Applied functional Analysis, Vol.7, NO.3,248-257, copyright 2012 Eudoxus Press, LLC.*

[Neč1967] J. Nečas *Les Methodes directes en théorie des equations elliptiques, Paris: Masson , 1967.*

Alzaki.M.M. Fadlallah
Department of Mathematics, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294-1170, USA
E-mail address: zakima99@@math.uab.edu